

REMARKS

Claims 14-21 and 46-61 were pending as of the action mailed on August 28, 2009.
Claims 14, 46, and 54 are in independent form.

Claims 14, 46, and 54 are being amended for clarity. No new matter has been added.
Reconsideration of the action is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The examiner rejected claims 14-21 and 46-61 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,724,593 ("Hargrave").

Drawings

The applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate that the drawing sheets FIGS. 1-12 filed on September 30, 2003, are acceptable. The examiner noted that they were received and stored, but did not indicate in the Office Action Summary that the drawings were accepted.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 14, 46, and 54

Claim 14, as amended, recites a search method that includes obtaining a search query including one or more terms where each term is written in a first format and translating the one or more terms of the search query into a group of translated queries, each translated query having one or more terms in a second format. Thus, the terms of a received query written in one format are translated into a group of translated queries having terms written in a second format.

The method further includes using the group of translated search queries to search a database for information identifying documents responsive to one or more translated queries of the group of translated queries and returning search results written in the second format to the user, the search results referencing one or more documents responsive to the one or more translated queries. Thus, translated queries are used to search a database for information identifying documents responsive to one or more translated queries.

The examiner states that Hargrave discloses searching a database for information responsive to one or more translated queries of the group of translated queries at col. 5, lines 10-22, col. 9, line 36 to col. 10, line 2; col. 11, lines 6-36; and col. 12, line 38 to col. 14, lines 16. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Hargrave discloses techniques for computer assisted translation of text strings in a source language to target language text strings. *See* Abstract. Hargrave uses pointers mapping source language n-grams with aligned target language n-grams. *See* Abstract. However, each of the portions relied upon by the examiner relate to searching a translation memory database in order to obtain a translated text string from an input text string. In particular, col. 5, lines 10-22 discloses a translation memory having an aligned file for associating source text segments with translated text segments. Col. 9, line 36 to col. 10, line 2 discloses the process of creating a text segment vector file from the source language text using aligned pairs. The vectors are used to search the source text file in response to a query. Col. 11, lines 6-36 describe indexing in the translation memory to allow the system to quickly find translation segments. Finally, col. 12, line 38 to col. 14, line 16 discloses correlating different text segments in the aligned pair file and finally the retrieval process for identifying a translation similar to the text of a query text segment.

Again, in each case, the cited portions refer to the translation system from which an input source text can be matched to a translation text. By contrast, claim 14 recites translating a search query and then uses one or more translated queries to search a database for documents responsive to the translated queries. The cited portions do not refer to using the translated result and particularly do not disclose or suggest using the group of translated search queries to search a database for information identifying documents responsive to one or more translated queries of the group of translated queries.

In responding to the applicant's prior arguments, the examiner fails to address this distinction. Instead, the examiner argues that Hargrave discloses searching a database in order to translate source language segments. *See* office action, page 8 ("Hargrave clearly disclosed

searching the “TM” database for source language segment to produce translated text segments via the associations of the source language segment to the translated text segments”).

This does not correspond to the claim language. Nevertheless, the applicant has further clarified the language of claim 14. As set forth above, claim 14 recites translating terms of a search query into a group of translated queries and then using the group of translated search queries to search a database for information identifying documents responsive to one or more translated queries of the group of translated queries.

The applicant respectfully submits that claim 14, as well as claims 15-21, which depend from claim 14, are in condition for allowance.

Claims 46 and 54, as amended, recite features similar to claim 14 and were rejected for the same reasons. Therefore, the applicant respectfully submits that claims 46 and 54 are allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to claim 14. Claims 47-53 and 55-61 depend from claims 46 and 54, respectively, and are allowable for at least the same reason.

Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, the applicant submits that all the claims are in condition for allowance.

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant’s selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant’s decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Applicant : Mittal et al.
Serial No. : 10/676,724
Filed : September 30, 2003
Page : 10 of 10

Attorney Docket No.: 16113-1300001

Please apply any credits or charges to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 23, 2009

/Brian J. Gustafson/

Brian J. Gustafson

Reg. No. 52,978

Customer No. 26192
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071